



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/600,338	10/12/2000	Oliver Opitz	FA/201	2659	
7590 04/20/2004 EXAMINER		INER			
Allan M Wheatcraft			BOYD, JE	BOYD, JENNIFER A	
W L Gore & Associates Inc 551 Paper Mill-Road PO-Box 9206 Newark, DE 19714-9206			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1771		

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		X4	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advison, Action	09/600,338	OPITZ, OLIVER	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	T
	Jennifer A Boyd	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ado	Iress
THE REPLY FILED 3/25/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 1 (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing a FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail.	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appr unt of the fee. The appr originally set in the final	on. See MPEP copriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	ially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) They present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to) issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	· · · —		ind an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-22,24-27,29,31-34,36,37</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr	oved or b)☐ disapproved by th	e Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
 0 Other:			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's Arguments are not persuasive. The Examiner maintains all previously set forth rejections as detailed in paragraphs 3 - 4 of the Office Action dated 1/21/04. In response to Applicant's arguments regarding the combination of Thornton, Caldwell and Gore, the Examiner notes that the Gore reference is used to modify the water vapor permeable functional layer of Thornton NOT Caldwell. The Caldwell reference is used to modify Thornton by suggesting the use of a fluorochemical treatment to create a waterproof and breathable composite. It should be noted that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

Just Bord 4/12/04

Ula C. Ruddock

Ma Ruddock

Primary Examiner Tech Center 1700